

# LINKAGE

The 2004 Linkage  
**Excellence in Management &  
Leadership Series**

## **Leading Change**

### **Participant Guide**



Featuring Mikhail Gorbachev

**LINKAGE**  
*INCORPORATED*

© 2004 Linkage, Inc. All rights reserved.

Dear Participant:

Welcome to the Linkage broadcast, *Leading Change*. This is the eighth of ten broadcasts in Linkage's 2004 Excellence in Management & Leadership Series and features Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1985 to 1991 and president of the Soviet Union in 1990-91.

Mr. Gorbachev will relate his experiences in leading arguably one of the most significant changes in this century – democratizing his country's political system and decentralizing its economy, which led to the downfall of communism and the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991. Using these experiences, Mr. Gorbachev will discuss leadership and change.

In this 90-minute broadcast, Mr. Gorbachev draws on his experience as former president of the Soviet Union to discuss both the opportunities and challenges inherent in leading organizations in today's ever-changing and interconnected world. Mr. Gorbachev will address:

- The historical perspective on today's rapidly changing climate and economy.
- The key components in affecting change.
- The attributes and characteristics required of leaders of change.

These participant materials have been designed to complement your participation in this broadcast with Mr. Gorbachev. Use the materials **before** the broadcast to learn more about Mr. Gorbachev and his leadership philosophy.

Mr. Gorbachev will speak for the first hour and then respond to questions for the next 30 minutes. Use the materials **during** the broadcast to record your notes, ideas, questions, and insights. Towards the end of the presentation, you will be asked to submit questions directly to Mr. Gorbachev via fax, telephone, and/or email. Your submission of questions is critical to the success of the program.

Most importantly, use the materials **after** the broadcast to help you implement the principles and techniques as you lead your organization. Use the materials as your ongoing source of renewal, energy, and direction.

## About Linkage

Linkage, Inc. is a global organizational development company that specializes in leadership development. Serving the public and private sectors, the Company provides clients around the globe with integrated solutions that include strategic consulting services, customized on-site training experiences, tailored assessment services, and benchmark research.

With a relentless commitment to learning, Linkage also offers a full range of conferences, institutes, summits, public workshops, and distance learning programs on leading-edge topics in leadership, management, HR, and OD. More than 100,000 leaders and managers have attended such a Linkage program since the Company's founding in 1988.

Linkage is headquartered in Burlington, Massachusetts, with regional offices in Minneapolis, Atlanta, San Francisco, London, and Brussels. On two occasions, Linkage has been named to the Inc. 500, a list of the fastest-growing private companies in the United States.

## Upcoming Events

Please join us for these upcoming programs. These broadcasts are offered live, by Linkage, on the following dates and times. Please check with the individual responsible for the broadcasts within your organization for any internal changes to the schedule.

November 17, 2004 (11:00am – 12:30pm EST/4:00pm – 5:30pm GMT)

***The Essential Transition: Helping Managers Learn to Lead* – General Tommy**

**Franks**, Four Star General, Former Commander and Chief, U.S. Central Command

November 30, 2004 (11:00am – 12:30pm EST/4:00pm – 5:30pm GMT)

***Lessons in Leadership* – Richard Branson**, Founder and CEO of Virgin Corporation

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

About Linkage.....	2
Upcoming Events .....	2
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION 1: PROGRAM MATERIALS</b>	
Introduction and Basic Premise.....	5
Question-and-Answer Session.....	6
When the Session Has Concluded.....	6
Pre-Broadcast Reading: Biography of Mikhail Gorbachev.....	7
Pre-Broadcast Reading: Nobel Peace Prize Presentation Speech .....	9
Pre-Broadcast Reading: Selected Portions of Mikhail Gorbachev's Nobel Lecture .....	13
During The Program .....	21
Notes .....	22
Post-Broadcast Activities.....	26
Books Written By or About Mikhail Gorbachev .....	31
<b>SECTION 2: FORMS</b>	
Question Sheet.....	33
Evaluation Form .....	34

## **SECTION 1**

### **PROGRAM MATERIALS**

## Introduction and Basic Premise

Few people have had the impact on a nation and the world as Mikhail Gorbachev. While history is still being written about the total and final impact of his two primary contributions – perestroika (restructuring, especially government/control) and glasnost (openness, freedom) – Gorbachev’s efforts to affect change within the Soviet Union are undeniable and without parallel.

Leading change is a complex and dynamic process with sometimes unexpected outcomes and consequences. While many have written about the complexity of change and how to affect lasting change, few have lived it to the degree – and with the consequences – that Gorbachev has.

Change leaders must first and foremost lead from the heart. They must BELIEVE in order to be believed. Often, leading change can be a journey with an imaginary destination – a vision. The effective change leader has a vision and BELIEVES in the vision. Gorbachev had a vision for a new Soviet Union, one that opened the socialistic society and offered freedom and prosperity to its people.

Effective change leaders secondarily must be *politic*. *Politic* is rooted in the Greek word politikos – “of a citizen” – and means “having practical wisdom; prudent; shrewd; diplomatic.” Effective change leaders recognize that change is initiated and carried out through people, people with personal agendas, unique interests, and real needs. In fact, according to some experts, over 80% of change efforts fail, most often because the leader didn’t recognize the potential of “the citizen” to support – or thwart – the change.

In hindsight, the changes initiated by Mr. Gorbachev were radical; at the time, they were heresy! Mr. Gorbachev was instrumental in nuclear disarmament at a time when The Cold War was just heating up! It would take a leader with belief in a vision, a vision that was rooted in the citizenry – not just of the USSR, but also of the world – to change a way of thinking and living and begin reducing the nuclear arsenal of one of the two biggest superpowers in the world.

Gorbachev initiated even greater changes through perestroika – the policy of restructuring and reforming the economic, political, and social systems of the U.S.S.R. From modest beginnings at the Twenty-Seventh Party Congress in 1986, perestroika – Mikhail Gorbachev’s program of economic, political, and social restructuring – became the unintended catalyst for dismantling what had taken nearly three-quarters of a century to erect: the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist totalitarian state.

The world watched in disbelief but with growing admiration as Soviet forces withdrew from Afghanistan, democratic governments overturned Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, Germany was reunited, the Warsaw Pact withered away, and the Cold War came to an abrupt end. Mr. Gorbachev introduced policies designed to begin establishing a market economy by encouraging limited private ownership and profitability in Soviet industry and agriculture.

These changes – arguably the changes having greatest impact on the world in this century – were initiated by one man with a singular belief and vision. In his presentation, Mr. Gorbachev shares

his experiences so that we may draw from them the insight, wisdom, and strength to affect change in our own organizations.

### **Question-and-Answer Session**

Mr. Gorbachev will dedicate the last 30 minutes of his live broadcast to answer your questions. Complete the Question Form found on the next to last page of this participant guide and:

- If you are participating in the live presentation of this program, fax, e-mail, or call in your questions using the instructions on the Question Form. Your seminar coordinator may collect your questions and send them in collectively.
- If you are participating in a recorded presentation of this program, share your questions with your seminar coordinator to be answered during your post-broadcast activities.

### **When the Session Has Concluded**

- Your feedback is valuable in ensuring the integrity of future programs. We take pride in providing relevant, thought-provoking and enlightening programs – and we rely on you to help make this happen. Please complete the program evaluation form on the last page of this guide or online at: [http://www.linkageinc.com/disl/satellite\\_evals.shtml](http://www.linkageinc.com/disl/satellite_evals.shtml).
- To further reinforce your understanding of today's information, as well as hone other aspects of your leadership skills, complete the recommended post-broadcast activities that begin on page 26 of this participant guide.

*And in the end, it's not  
the years in your life  
that count. It's the life in  
your years.*

Abraham Lincoln

*Dreams pass into the  
reality of action. From  
the actions stems the  
dream again; and this  
interdependence  
produces the highest  
form of living.*

Anais Nin

## Pre-Broadcast Reading: Biography of Mikhail Gorbachev

The following is a timeline of Mikhail S. Gorbachev's life:

1931: March 2, born, Privolnoye, Krasnogvardeisky District, Stavropol territory in the North Caucasus, to a peasant family in a small village, his father an agricultural mechanic on a collective farm.

1942: German army occupies the Privolnoye area.

1945: Begins work as assistant to combine harvest operator.

1949: Awarded Order of Red Banner of Labour.

1950: Enrolled in Faculty of Law, Moscow University.

1952: After having been a member of Komsomol (Communist Youth Organisation), now joined the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

1955: Marries Raisa Maximovna Titorenko, philosophy student. Receives degree in law.

1955-60: Appointed First Secretary, Komsomol Territorial Committee, then moves up to higher posts, finally becoming top Komsomol official in Stavropol.

1956: Daughter Irina born.

1961: Delegate from Stavropol to 22<sup>nd</sup> Communist Party Congress in Moscow.

1962: Appointed to key position in Stavropol Communist Party, responsible for personnel in administration, farms and industry.

1964-67: Studies for second degree at Stavropol Agricultural Institute.

1970: Appointed First Secretary for Stavropol territory, governing an area of 2.4 million people.

1971: Member CPSU Central Committee.

1978: Moves to Moscow as Secretary of Agriculture in Central Committee.

1980: Becomes youngest full member of Politburo.

1985: March, Elected by Central Committee as General Secretary of CPSU.

1989: Elected by new parliament as Executive President of Soviet Union.

1990: Awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.



*My will shall shape the future. Whether I fail or succeed shall be no man's doing but my own. I am the force; I can clear any obstacle before me or I can be lost in the maze. My choice; my responsibility; win or lose, only I hold the key to my destiny.*

Elaine Maxwell

1991: August, abortive coup of hardliners, resigns as General Secretary of CPSU, dissolves Central Committee.

1991: December 25, resigns as President when Soviet Union disintegrates.

1992: Head of Foundation for Social, Economic and Political Research, think-tank founded after August coup.

Since leaving office in 1992, Mr. Gorbachev has founded several organizations and initiatives that continue his work. Most notably, he is President of the International Foundation for Socio-Economic and Political Studies (The Gorbachev Foundation) based in Moscow, and Green Cross International headquartered in Geneva.

Mr. Gorbachev's wife, Raisa, passed away in 1999 leaving one daughter, Irina Virganskaya, and two granddaughters, Ksenia and Anastasia.

Mr. Gorbachev resides in Moscow.

## Pre-Broadcast Reading: Nobel Peace Prize Presentation Speech

(Presentation of the Nobel Peace Prize to Mikhail Gorbachev in Oslo, December 10, 1990 by Gidske Anderson, Chairperson of the Norwegian Nobel Committee.)

Your Royal Highnesses, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

This year's Nobel Peace Prize has been awarded to the President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee has made this award in recognition of the leading role he has played in the radical changes that have taken place in East-West relations. President Gorbachev has undoubtedly cooperated with other persons and other nations. But we recognise quite clearly that his manifold personal contributions and his efforts on behalf of the Soviet Union have proved decisive. For this reason the Nobel Committee has in 1990 decided to honour him.

We are experiencing dramatic changes in a world that is still rent with conflict. Nevertheless, we also have clear evidence that a peace process has started. East and West, the two mighty power blocs, have managed to abandon their life-threatening confrontation and have, instead, embarked on the long and patient road to cooperation on the basis of negotiation. The task now is to create a peaceful framework for the far-reaching transformation which will inevitably continue to take place in our part of the world.

We have already seen the fruits of this new climate between East and West.

Ancient European nations, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and now East Germany too, have regained their freedom and have, for better or for worse, assumed responsibility for their own national destiny. Even though this process of detente still has its problems and is yet not terminated in all parts of our continent of Europe, it is nevertheless possible today, maybe for the first time in many hundreds of years, to envisage a Europe of the people and, we hope, also a Europe at peace.

This is due not least to the fact that the armaments race is ebbing out in our part of the globe.

In mistrust and fear this race has been going on for close on half a century. The result has been a terrifying waste of intellectual and material resources on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Here too, we now at last see a change.

Comprehensive negotiations, bilateral as well as multilateral, accompanied by concrete and realistic compromise, have led to a process involving substantial reductions in standing armies and death-dealing armaments. Within the last few months disarmament agreements have been reached which are without parallel in our part of the world, in this or indeed in previous centuries.

In making this year's award of the Peace Prize, the Nobel Committee wishes to emphasise the tremendous potential which is now available for a more secure world, and for a more responsible and rational use of our resources.

The way in which confrontation has been replaced by cooperation has also had its consequences in other parts of the world. Several regional conflicts have been resolved, or at least come closer to a solution. The uncompromising attitude of the Cold War has given way to a pattern of negotiation, in which the interests and responsibility of the regional communities themselves have replaced old ideological considerations, or the all-too-often ruthless laws of the balance of power.

These changes have given the United Nations a new lease of life: for the first time since its creation after the Second World War this organisation has been able to play the role for which it was originally intended. It can now start to exercise its supremely important responsibility for the creation of an international community based on the rule of law and the establishment of peace between nations.

The award this year of the Peace Prize to the President of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, is an historic event not least because some of the previous awards made by our Committee - for example to the great champion of human rights Andrei Sakharov in 1975, and to the trade union leader Lech Walesa in 1983 - were received with cool hostility in the Soviet Union and in Poland at the time, involving the rejection, in these countries, of all that the Norwegian Nobel Committee stood for. On these grounds too the award constitutes a landmark. The Norwegian Nobel Committee considers that there is thus a historical link between today's event and December 10th, 1975, and 1983, which augurs well for the future.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee is an independent organisation answerable neither to the Government nor to the National Assembly (the Storting) of our country. The five members of the Committee are only answerable to their own consciences, and their decisions are based on the personal political judgment and sound common sense of each one. The guidelines governing our work are nevertheless clearly set out: these are to be found in Alfred Nobel's testament, written nearly a hundred years ago.

The award this year is very much in line with Alfred Nobel's own wishes and desires. Nobel wanted the prize to be awarded to someone who had worked to promote "fraternity between nations". That was the expression generally used in his day to denote the substitution of international cooperation for conflict. Nobel also wished his prize to be given to someone who had actively promoted a reduction in "standing armies" and worked for the "holding of peace congresses", what we today would call disarmament and negotiation.

Seldom has our Committee felt more in tune with Alfred Nobel's wishes than this year.

It is with a special sense of satisfaction that we award the Peace Prize to President Gorbachev. Each one of us, maybe in our different ways, has experienced the tension and threat of war that have cast a dark shadow over all the post-war years. The new-found openness and willingness to cooperate shown by the Soviet Union, and its readiness to accept realistic compromise, have created fresh hope under his leadership.

We fully realise that the Soviet Union is undergoing a dramatic period of transformation within its own borders: dictatorship is to be replaced by greater democracy, centralisation by the right of each republic for self-determination, a command economy by a freer market. This transformation is inevitably a painful process, involving great sacrifice. But we should like the many peoples of the Soviet Union to know that the respect and expectation of the outside world for their great country have never been as profound as today. There has been nothing comparable since the "Great Patriotic War", which this country and our Western Allies fought together against the barbarism of National Socialism. At that time the road that led from world war to Cold War proved disappointingly short. It is our hope that we are now celebrating the end of the Cold War.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was born in 1931 in a small village just outside Stavropol, north of the Caucasus Mountains, in a region that forms part of the Russian Republic, adjoining the ancient non-Russian countries of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, with their profound Christian and Muslim roots. Our laureate is in fact a native of the southern Soviet Union. He comes of peasant stock, and was born 14 years after the great revolution which shook not only the Russian Empire but the entire world. He was born during the dramatic collectivisation of Soviet agriculture, and grew up on a collective farm, where his father worked at a tractor station.

He was an eight-year-old schoolboy when the last world war broke out, and only 10 years old when Germany attacked the Soviet Union. His schooling was both sporadic and limited by wartime conditions: he was forced to work as a replacement for soldiers fighting at the front. When peace came he was 14 years old, and was able to continue his education, but, in common with most young people of his age, worked during his summer holidays. He was soon involved in the Communist Party's youth organisation, and was rapidly promoted. As a matter of course he joined the Communist party at the age of 21.

Two years before, he had left his native village in the Northern Caucasus, and made his way to the capital to embark on the study of law at the University of Moscow. Here he not only met Raisa Titorenko, who subsequently became his wife, but was also active in the Communist Party student movement, with responsibility for ideology and propaganda among fellow students in his faculty. He took a degree in law and then returned to Stavropol, where he was employed full-time in the Communist youth movement. By the age of 25 he was in fact a member of the establishment, with agricultural questions as his chief concern. In 1967, he took a second degree, this time in agriculture, and was rapidly promoted in the local party hierarchy.

By the 1970s this year's laureate was active politically on the national scene: his breakthrough came in 1978, when at the age of 47, he was given joint responsibility for the entire agricultural set-up of the Soviet Union in the Communist Party's Secretariat in Moscow, which meant permanent residence in the capital. Seven years later he was elected leader of the Soviet Union's Communist Party, the most influential post in the country. This was in 1985, by which time he was 54 years old. He is now a figure of international prominence. While still retaining the position of Party Secretary, he is also elected President of the Soviet Union by a reformed parliament.

Although Mikhail Gorbachev is a man of quite outstanding talent and ability, he insisted recently that the story of his own family is actually history itself or in other words the history of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev is in fact a child of the revolution and the world war, of Lenin's, Stalin's,

Khrushchev's and Breshnev's Soviet Union. And like most people in this world he is a product of the society in which he grew up.

Today, this Soviet society is a historical experiment which is being shaken to its foundations, and this is so not least because Mikhail Gorbachev was also capable of breaking the mould of the society from which he sprang. Or as he personally expressed it in the televised interview, in which he spoke of the perestroika which he symbolises: "We came to the conclusion that we could no longer continue to live the way we were. We needed major changes in every department of life."

Our laureate has in fact been a Communist all his life; and he still is to this day, even though this might shock us, as he declared in an interview he recently gave in the USA. We are not really so shocked. But this is neither the time nor the place to discuss the Soviet Union's internal affairs. The Norwegian Nobel Committee has given President Gorbachev the Peace Prize for his leading role in international politics.

Our Committee has nonetheless observed one aspect of life in the Soviet Union - the much greater openness President Gorbachev has introduced. This has to a very large extent helped to promote international confidence. Greater openness has in many ways ensured a basis for the comprehensive agreements on disarmament and cooperation between East and West that we are witnessing today.

An entire world is today watching the Soviet Union's dramatic and heroic struggle to overcome the awesome economic, social and political problems which shake the country. The Norwegian Nobel Committee, not least, is also watching.

It is our wish that the award of the Peace Prize to its President, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, will be recognised as a helping hand in an hour of need, as a greeting to all the peoples of the Soviet Union, as a sign that the outside world is watching their struggle with a sense of fellow feeling, and with a sense of participating in the historical events that are taking place.

It has been suggested that the award of this year's prize to the President of the Soviet Union by the Nobel Committee was somewhat bold. Our boldness is, however, nothing like the boldness shown by Mikhail Gorbachev when he embarked on the course which has today led to the receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize, or the boldness shown by the many peoples of the Soviet Union too in rewriting history.

*From Nobel Lectures, Peace 1981-1990, Editor-in-Charge Tore Frängsmyr, Editor Irwin Abrams, World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, 1997*

## Pre-Broadcast Reading: Selected Portions of Mikhail Gorbachev's Nobel Lecture

June 5, 1991

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,

This moment is no less emotional for me than the one when I first learned about the decision of the Nobel Committee. For on similar occasions great men addressed humankind - men famous for their courage in working to bring together morality and politics. Among them were my compatriots.

...

I consider the decision of your Committee as a recognition of the great international importance of the changes now under way in the Soviet Union, and as an expression of confidence in our policy of new thinking, which is based on the conviction that at the end of the twentieth century force and arms will have to give way as a major instrument in world politics.

I see the decision to award me the Nobel Peace Prize also as an act of solidarity with the monumental undertaking which has already placed enormous demands on the Soviet people in terms of efforts, costs, hardships, willpower, and character. And solidarity is a universal value which is becoming indispensable for progress and for the survival of humankind.

But a modern state has to be worthy of solidarity, in other words, it should pursue, in both domestic and international affairs, policies that bring together the interests of its people and those of the world community. This task, however obvious, is not a simple one. Life is much richer and more complex than even the most perfect plans to make it better. It ultimately takes vengeance for attempts to impose abstract schemes, even with the best of intentions. Perestroika has made us understand this about our past, and the actual experience of recent years has taught us to reckon with the most general laws of civilization.

This, however, came later. But back in March-April 1985 we found ourselves facing a crucial, and I confess, agonizing choice. When I agreed to assume the office of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee, in effect the highest State office at that time, I realized that we could no longer live as before and that I would not want to remain in that office unless I got support in undertaking major reforms. It was clear to me that we had a long way to go. But of course, I could not imagine how immense were our problems and difficulties. I believe no one at that time could foresee or predict them.

Those who were then governing the country knew what was really happening to it and what we later called "zastoi", roughly translated as "stagnation". They saw that our society was marking time, that it was running the risk of falling hopelessly behind the technologically advanced part of the world. Total domination of centrally-managed state property, the pervasive authoritarian-bureaucratic system, ideology's grip on politics, monopoly in social thought and sciences, militarized industries that siphoned off our best, including the best intellectual resources, the

unbearable burden of military expenditures that suffocated civilian industries and undermined the social achievements of the period since the Revolution which were real and of which we used to be proud - such was the actual situation in the country.

As a result, one of the richest countries in the world, endowed with immense overall potential, was already sliding downwards. Our society was declining, both economically and intellectually.

And yet, to a casual observer the country seemed to present a picture of relative well-being, stability and order. The misinformed society under the spell of propaganda was hardly aware of what was going on and what the immediate future had in store for it. The slightest manifestations of protest were suppressed. Most people considered them heretical, slanderous and counter-revolutionary.

Such was the situation in the spring of 1985, and there was a great temptation to leave things as they were, to make only cosmetic changes. This, however, meant continuing to deceive ourselves and the people.

This was the domestic aspect of the dilemma then before us. As for the foreign policy aspect, there was the East-West confrontation, a rigid division into friends and foes, the two hostile camps with a corresponding set of Cold War attributes. Both the East and the West were constrained by the logic of military confrontation, wearing themselves down more and more by the arms race.

The mere thought of dismantling the existing structures did not come easily. However, the realization that we faced inevitable disaster, both domestically and internationally, gave us the strength to make a historic choice, which I have never since regretted.

Perestroika, which once again is returning our people to commonsense, has enabled us to open up to the world, and has restored a normal relationship between the country's internal development and its foreign policy. But all this takes a lot of hard work. To a people which believed that its government's policies had always been true to the cause of peace, we proposed what was in many ways a different policy, which would genuinely serve the cause of peace, while differing from the prevailing view of what it meant and particularly from the established stereotypes as to how one should protect it. We proposed new thinking in foreign policy.

Thus, we embarked on a path of major changes which may turn out to be the most significant in the twentieth century, for our country and for its peoples. But we also did this for the entire world.

I began my book about perestroika and the new thinking with the following words: "We want to be understood". After a while I felt that it was already happening. But now I would like once again to repeat those words here, from this world rostrum. Because to understand us really - to understand so as to believe us - proved to be not at all easy, owing to the immensity of the changes under way in our country. Their magnitude and character are such as to require in-depth analysis. Applying conventional wisdom to perestroika is unproductive. It is also futile and dangerous to set conditions, to say: We'll understand and believe you, as soon as you, the Soviet Union, come completely to resemble "us", the West.

No one is in a position to describe in detail what perestroika will finally produce. But it would certainly be a self-delusion to expect that perestroika will produce “a copy” of anything.

Of course, learning from the experience of others is something we have been doing and will continue to do. But this does not mean that we will come to be exactly like others. Our State will preserve its own identity within the international community. A country like ours, with its uniquely close-knit ethnic composition, cultural diversity and tragic past, the greatness of its historic endeavors and the exploits of its peoples - such a country will find its own path to the civilization of the twenty-first century and its own place in it. Perestroika has to be conceived solely in this context; otherwise it will fail and will be rejected. After all, it is impossible to “shed” the country’s thousand-year history - a history, which, we still have to subject to serious analysis in order to find the truth that we shall take into the future.

We want to be an integral part of modern civilization, to live in harmony with mankind’s universal values, abide by the norms of international law, follow the “rules of the game” in our economic relations with the outside world. We want to share with all other peoples the burden of responsibility for the future of our common house.

A period of transition to a new quality in all spheres of society’s life is accompanied by painful phenomena. When we were initiating perestroika we failed to properly assess and foresee everything. Our society turned out to be hard to move off the ground, not ready for major changes which affect people’s vital interests and make them leave behind everything to which they had become accustomed over many years. In the beginning we imprudently generated great expectations, without taking into account the fact that it takes time for people to realize that all have to live and work differently, to stop expecting that new life would be given from above.

Perestroika has now entered its most dramatic phase. Following the transformation of the philosophy of perestroika into real policy, which began literally to explode the old way of life, difficulties began to mount. Many took fright and wanted to return to the past. It was not only those who used to hold the levers of power in the administration, the army and various government agencies and who had to make room, but also many people whose interests and way of life was put to a severe test and who, during the preceding decades, had forgotten how to take the initiative and to be independent, enterprising and self-reliant.

Hence the discontent, the outbursts of protest and the exorbitant, though understandable, demands which, if satisfied right away, would lead to complete chaos. Hence, the rising political passions and, instead of a constructive opposition which is only normal in a democratic system, one that is often destructive and unreasonable, not to mention the extremist forces which are especially cruel and inhuman in areas of inter-ethnic conflict.

During the last six years we have discarded and destroyed much that stood in the way of a renewal and transformation of our society. But when society was given freedom it could not recognize itself, for it had lived too long, as it were, “beyond the looking glass”. Contradictions and vices rose to the surface, and even blood has been shed, although we have been able to avoid a bloodbath. The logic of reform has clashed with the logic of rejection, and with the logic of impatience which breeds intolerance.



In this situation, which is one of great opportunity and of major risks, at a high point of perestroika's crisis, our task is to stay the course while also addressing current everyday problems - which are literally tearing this policy apart - and to do it in such a way as to prevent a social and political explosion.

Now about my position. As to the fundamental choice, I have long ago made a final and irrevocable decision. Nothing and no one, no pressure, either from the right or from the left, will make me abandon the positions of perestroika and new thinking. I do not intend to change my views or convictions. My choice is a final one.

It is my profound conviction that the problems arising in the course of our transformations can be solved solely by constitutional means. That is why I make every effort to keep this process within the confines of democracy and reforms.

This applies also to the problem of self-determination of nations, which is a challenging one for us. We are looking for mechanisms to solve that problem within the framework of a constitutional process; we recognize the peoples' legitimate choice, with the understanding that if a people really decides, through a fair referendum, to withdraw from the Soviet Union, a certain agreed transition period will then be needed.

Steering a peaceful course is not easy in a country where generation after generation of people were led to believe that those who have power or force could throw those who dissent or disagree out of politics or even in jail. For centuries all the country's problems used to be finally resolved by violent means. All this has left an almost indelible mark on our entire "political culture", if the term is at all appropriate in this case.

Our democracy is being born in pain. A political culture is emerging - one that presupposes debate and pluralism, but also legal order and, if democracy is to work, strong government authority based on one law for all. This process is gaining strength. Being resolute in the pursuit of perestroika, a subject of much debate these days, must be measured by the commitment to democratic change. Being resolute does not mean a return to repression, diktat or the suppression of rights and freedoms. I will never agree to having our society split once again into Reds and Whites, into those who claim to speak and act "on behalf of the people" and those who are "enemies of the people". Being resolute today means to act within the framework of political and social pluralism and the rule of law to provide conditions for continued reform and prevent a breakdown of the state and economic collapse, prevent the elements of chaos from becoming catastrophic.

All this requires taking certain tactical steps, to search for various ways of addressing both short- and long-term tasks. Such efforts and political and economic steps, agreements based on reasonable compromise, are there for everyone to see. I am convinced that the One-Plus-Nine Statement will go down in history as one such step, as a great opportunity<sup>1</sup>. Not all parts of our decisions are readily accepted or correctly understood. For the most part, our decisions are unpopular; they arouse waves of criticism. But life has many more surprises in store for us, just as we will sometimes surprise it. Jumping to conclusions after every step taken by the Soviet leadership, after every decree by the President, trying to figure out whether he is moving left or right, backward or forward, would be an exercise in futility and would not lead to understanding.

We will seek answers to the questions we face only by moving forward, only by continuing and even radicalizing reforms, by consistently democratizing our society. But we will proceed prudently, carefully weighing each step we take.

There is already a consensus in our society that we have to move towards a mixed market economy. There are still differences as to how to do it and how fast we should move. Some are in favor of rushing through a transitional period as fast as possible, no matter what. Although this may smack of adventurism we should not overlook the fact that such views enjoy support. People are tired and are easily swayed by populism. So it would be just as dangerous to move too slowly, to keep people waiting in suspense. For them, life today is difficult, a life of considerable hardship.

Work on a new Union Treaty has entered its final stage. Its adoption will open a new chapter in the history of our multinational state.

After a time of rampant separatism and euphoria, when almost every village proclaimed sovereignty, a centripetal force is beginning to gather momentum, based on a more sensible view of existing realities and the risks involved. And this is what counts most now. There is a growing will to achieve consensus, and a growing understanding that we have a State, a country, a common life. This is what must be preserved first of all. Only then can we afford to start figuring out which party or club to join and what God to worship.

The stormy and contradictory process of perestroika, particularly in the past two years, has made us face squarely the problem of criteria to measure the effectiveness of State leadership. In the new environment of a multiparty system, freedom of thought, rediscovered ethnic identity and sovereignty of the republics, the interests of society must absolutely be put above those of various parties or groups, or any other sectoral, parochial or private interests, even though they also have the right to exist and to be represented in the political process and in public life, and, of course, they must be taken into account in the policies of the State.

...

The more I reflect on the current world developments, the more I become convinced that the world needs perestroika no less than the Soviet Union needs it.

...

If we fail to reach an understanding regarding a new phase of cooperation, we will have to look for other ways, for time is of the essence. But if we are to move to that new phase, those who participate in and even shape world politics also must continue to change, to review their philosophic perception of the changing realities of the world and of its imperatives. Otherwise, there is no point in drawing up a joint program of practical action.

...

To me, it is self-evident that if Soviet perestroika succeeds, there will be a real chance of building a new world order. And if perestroika fails, the prospect of entering a new peaceful period in history will vanish, at least for the foreseeable future.

I believe that the movement that we have launched towards that goal has fairly good prospects of success. After all, mankind has already benefited greatly in recent years, and this has created a certain positive momentum.

The Cold War is over. The risk of a global nuclear war has practically disappeared. The Iron Curtain is gone. Germany has united, which is a momentous milestone in the history of Europe. There is not a single country on our continent which would not regard itself as fully sovereign and independent.

The USSR and the USA, the two nuclear superpowers, have moved from confrontation to interaction and, in some important cases, partnership. This has had a decisive effect on the entire international climate. This should be preserved and filled with new substance. The climate of Soviet-US trust should be protected, for it is a common asset of the world community. Any revision of the direction and potential of the Soviet-US relationship would have grave consequences for the entire global process.

...

Armed forces and military budgets are being reduced. Foreign troops are leaving the territories of other countries. Their strength is diminishing and their composition is becoming more defense-oriented. First steps have been taken in the conversion of military industries, and what seemed inconceivable is happening: recent Cold War adversaries are establishing cooperation in this area. Their military officials exchange visits, show each other military facilities that only recently used to be top secret and together consider ways to achieve demilitarization.

De-ideologizing relations among States, which we proclaimed as one of the principles of the new thinking, has brought down many prejudices, biased attitudes and suspicions and has cleared and improved the international atmosphere.

...

In such a context, in the process of creating a new Europe, in which erstwhile "curtains" and "walls" will be forever relegated to the past and borders between States will lose their "divisive" purpose, self-determination of sovereign nations will be realized in a completely different way.

...

The new integrity of the world, in our view, can be built only on the principles of the freedom of choice and balance of interests. Every State, and now also a number of existing or emerging regional interstate groups, have their own interests. They are all equal and deserve respect.

We consider it dangerously outdated when suspicions are aroused by, for instance, improved Soviet-Chinese or Soviet-German, German-French, Soviet-US or US-Indian relations, etc. In our times, good relations benefit all. Any worsening of relations anywhere is a common loss.

Progress towards the civilization of the 21st century will certainly not be simple or easy. One cannot get rid overnight of the heavy legacy of the past or the dangers created in the post-war

years. We are experiencing a turning point in international affairs and are only at the beginning of a new, and I hope mostly peaceful, lengthy period in the history of civilization.

With less East-West confrontation, or even none at all, old contradictions resurface, which seemed of secondary importance compared to the threat of nuclear war. The melting ice of the Cold War reveals old conflicts and claims, and entirely new problems accumulate rapidly.

...

How can the world community cope with all this? All these tasks are enormously complex. They cannot be postponed. Tomorrow may be too late.

I am convinced that in order to solve these problems there is no other way but to seek and implement entirely new forms of interaction. We are simply doomed to such interaction, or we shall be unable to consolidate positive trends which have emerged and are gaining strength, and which we simply must not sacrifice.

However, to accomplish this all members of the world community should resolutely discard old stereotypes and motivations nurtured by the Cold War, and give up the habit of seeking each other's weak spots and exploiting them in their own interests. We have to respect the peculiarities and differences which will always exist, even when human rights and freedoms are observed throughout the world. I keep repeating that with the end of confrontation differences can be made a source of healthy competition, an important factor for progress. This is an incentive to study each other, to engage in exchanges, a prerequisite for the growth of mutual trust.

For knowledge and trust are the foundations of a new world order. Hence the necessity, in my view, to learn to forecast the course of events in various regions of the globe, by pooling the efforts of scientists, philosophers and humanitarian thinkers within the UN framework. Policies, even the most prudent and precise, are made by man. We need maximum insurance to guarantee that decisions taken by members of the world community should not affect the security, sovereignty and vital interests of its other members or damage the natural environment and the moral climate of the world.

I am an optimist and I believe that together we shall be able now to make the right historical choice so as not to miss the great chance at the turn of centuries and millennia and make the current extremely difficult transition to a peaceful world order. A balance of interests rather than a balance of power, a search for compromise and concord rather than a search for advantages at other people's expense, and respect for equality rather than claims to leadership - such are the elements which can provide the groundwork for world progress and which should be readily acceptable for reasonable people informed by the experience of the twentieth century.

The future prospect of truly peaceful global politics lies in the creation through joint efforts of a single international democratic space in which States shall be guided by the priority of human rights and welfare for their own citizens and the promotion of the same rights and similar welfare elsewhere. This is an imperative of the growing integrity of the modern world and of the interdependence of its components.

I have been suspected of utopian thinking more than once, and particularly when five years ago I proposed the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and joint efforts to create a system of international security. It may well be that by that date it will not have happened. But look, merely five years have passed and have we not actually and noticeably moved in that direction? Have we not been able to cross the threshold of mistrust, though mistrust has not completely disappeared? Has not the political thinking in the world changed substantially? Does not most of the world community already regard weapons of mass destruction as unacceptable for achieving political objectives?

...

In conclusion, let me say again that I view the award of the Nobel Prize to me as an expression of understanding of my intentions, my aspirations, the objectives of the profound transformation we have begun in our country, and the ideas of new thinking. I see it as your acknowledgment of my commitment to peaceful means of implementing the objectives of perestroika.

I am grateful for this to the members of the Committee and wish to assure them that if I understand correctly their motives, they are not mistaken.

*From Nobel Lectures, Peace 1981-1990, Editor-in-Charge Tore Frängsmyr, Editor Irwin Abrams, World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, 1997*

## During The Program

- Participate!
- Submit questions to be addressed by Mr. Gorbachev during the question-and-answer session. He will speak for the first hour and then respond to questions for the next 30 minutes, so again, your submission of questions is critical to the success of the program. To submit questions, complete the Question Sheet (found on the next to last page of this guide), submit an e-mail, or call in when prompted during the program.
- Mr. Gorbachev asks that you engage in the presentation and subsequent questions and answers. If you wish, use the following pages to take notes on points important to you.

Anonymous

Peter Senge

Andy Warhol

[illegible]

Charles DuBois

Eric Hoffer

## Gloria Steinem

[illegible]



## Helen Keller

Kenneth Kaunda

Margaret Mead

[illegible]

## Nelson Mandela

## Oliver Wendell Holmes

Robert F. Kennedy

[illegible]

*You do not lead by hitting people over the head - that's assault, not leadership.*

Dwight Eisenhower

**Post-Broadcast Activities**

Complete and submit the program evaluation form found on the last page of this guide or online at: [http://www.linkageinc.com/disl/satellite\\_evals.shtml](http://www.linkageinc.com/disl/satellite_evals.shtml).

**Activity 1: Self-Reflection and Discussion**

- What in Mr. Gorbachev’s presentation struck a special chord with you? Why?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- How do Mr. Gorbachev’s lessons relate to your role as change leader?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- Vision and politic – “of the citizenry” – are key elements of successful change. What do you envision for your team, department, or organization? How will your vision benefit “the citizenry”, your colleagues and employees?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*One person with passion unleashed can accomplish more than 99 people with mere enthusiasm enabled.*

Entelechy, Inc.

Kenneth Blanchard

Rosalynn Carter

## Woodrow Wilson

Mikhail Gorbachev writes in Memoirs, “The idea of writing an ‘account’ of my life and the reforms had been lingering in the back of my mind for some time.” He continues for over 700 pages to recount the challenges, triumphs, setbacks, decisions, and consequences of those decisions of his historic life.

Option #2: What will YOU write five years from now about your role as a change leader today and the near future? How will this understanding guide your current actions and choices?

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper has a slight shadow on the right side, suggesting it's resting on a surface.

Susan B. Anthony

Jesse Jackson

## Lessons Learned

*Small changes can produce big results - but the areas of highest leverage are often the least obvious.*

Peter Senge

*There is no blame. We tend to blame and externalize the problem. There is no 'outside.' You and the cause of your problems are part of a single system. The 'cure' is in the interaction.*

Peter Senge

### Activity 3: Changing a Culture

Peter Senge, in his book, The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization (Doubleday, New York, 1990) provides the following guiding principles for culture change:

- Don't push growth; remove the factors limiting growth. Remove or weaken the sources of limitation.
- In a sluggish system aggressiveness produces instability. Either be patient or first make the system more responsive.
- Hold the vision. Do not let performance standards or goals slide in a crisis or setback.
- Focus on the fundamental solution, as opposed to symptomatic solutions for the short term. Maintain the focus on the long term. Use short term 'fixes' only to buy time to work on the fundamentals.
- Teach people how to fish, rather than giving them fish. Develop the competencies and capabilities for the future.
- Cultures program the subconscious. Reprogram systems and structures through small well-focused actions. The principle is that of leverage - determining where actions and changes can lead to self-sustaining as opposed to self-limiting growth. And the effective leverage points are almost always never where it hurts the most.

Select one of the above principles and relate how the principle applies to Mr. Gorbachev's experiences. Then relate how the principle applies to your own experiences in affecting change.

[illegible]

**Final Activity: Action Planning**

Your change leadership development begins today. Picture yourself six months from now. You're reflecting with a sense of pride and satisfaction on what you've accomplished since the broadcast. As you look back, what one thing brings you the most pride?

---

---

---

---

Back to the present. With the above goal set for six months from now, what intermediary steps do you need to take to reach that goal?

- What do you need to do within three months?

---

---

---

- What do you need to do by the end of this month?

---

---

---

- What do you need to do by the end of this week?

---

---

---

- What do you need to do tomorrow?

---

---

---

*Often people complain that they just weren't given the opportunity.*

*Want more opportunity? Tackle more problems.*

*Want a bigger opportunity? Go after a bigger problem.*

*Don't have enough problems of your own? Go solve one of your boss's problems.*

*You'll learn more about a road by traveling it than by consulting all the maps in the world.*

Hannibal

## Books Written By or About Mikhail Gorbachev

The following books are written by Mikhail Gorbachev and are listed in order of publication:

- Conversations with Gorbachev. Mikhail Gorbachev, Zdenek Mlynar, and George Shriver. Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Gorbachev: On My Country and the World. Mikhail Gorbachev. Translated from Russian by George Shriver. Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Memoirs. Mikhail Gorbachev. Translated from the Russian by Georges Peronansky and Tatjana. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- The August Coup: The Truth and the Lessons. Mikhail Gorbachev. New York: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Perestroika. New Thinking for Our Country and the World. Mikhail Gorbachev. New York: Harper, 1988. (New updated edition. An explanation and a manifesto, with five chapters on foreign policy. Published in many languages.)

The following are some of the many books written about Mikhail Gorbachev:

- Russia Transformed: Breakthrough to Hope. James H. Billington. Free Press, 1992.
- The Gorbachev Factor. Archie Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Gorbachev: Heretic in the Kremlin. Dusko Doder and Louise Branson. Penguin USA, 1991.
- Gorbachev. Zhores A. Medvedev. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- I Hope: Reminiscences and Reflections. Raisa Gorbachev. New York: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Why Gorbachev Happened: His Triumphs and his Failures. Robert G. Kaiser. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991.
- Mikhail Gorbachev and the End of Soviet Power. John Miller. London: Macmillan, 1993.
- Lenin's Tomb: The Last Days of the Soviet Empire. David Remnick. New York, 1993.
- The New Russians. Hedrick Smith. New York: Random House, 1990.
- Russia's Unfinished Revolution: Political Change from Gorbachev to Putin. Michael McFaul. Cornell University Press, 2002.



## **SECTION 2**

### **FORMS**

**Question Sheet**

Use this form to write your question for Mr. Gorbachev for discussion. Please write legibly.

**Name (optional):**

---

**Organization:**

---

**Location:**

---

**Your question (25 words or fewer):**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Fax 1.877.892.0170 (from within U.S.)

Fax 646.349.3661 (from outside U.S.)

Email: *leadership2004@linkage-inc.com*

Tel 1.800.489.8814 (from within U.S.)

Tel 801.303.7412 (from outside U.S.)

---

# LINKAGE MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP EVALUATION FORM

## *Leading Change Featuring Mikhail Gorbachev*

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO YOUR SITE COORDINATOR OR FAX TO 781.402.5556.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

ORGANIZATION \_\_\_\_\_

**Please indicate functional area (only circle one):**

Finance   Human Resources/Organizational Development   Manufacturing/Operations   Marketing   R&D   Sales  
Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**How many people do you have reporting to you (include all levels)? Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please indicate your job level (only circle one):**

☐ President or Officer   ☐ Vice President   ☐ Director   ☐ Manager/Supervisor   ☐ Individual Contributor

-----  
**1) Please indicate a rating for each of the statements below by checking the appropriate box.**

	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
The length of the presentation was ideal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
As a result of participating in this program, I will be more effective in my role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The participant materials were useful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Q&A session was valuable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2) Please give a general overall comment about the program.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**3) Any suggestions on what we can do to improve?**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**4) May we use any of these comments for promotional purposes (including name and organization)?   Y   N**

**5) On a scale of 1-10 (10 = Outstanding), how would you rate this session?      Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_

**6) Which speakers are you most interested in seeing at the next Linkage Excellence in Leadership & Management Series? (Please rate your top five, "1" being most interested)**

\_\_\_ James Champy  
\_\_\_ Deborah Tannen  
\_\_\_ Steve Jobs  
\_\_\_ Philip Knight

\_\_\_ Edgar Shein  
\_\_\_ Maya Angelou  
\_\_\_ Francis Hesselbein  
\_\_\_ John Scully

\_\_\_ Margaret Wheatley  
\_\_\_ Robert Kaplan  
\_\_\_ Chris Argyris  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO YOUR SITE COORDINATOR OR FAX TO 781.402.5556.